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Foreword

2019 marks the 50th Anniversary of the first Peace Wall in Northern Ireland. Despite the 2013 ‘Together, Building a United Community’ (TBUC) commitment to have all Peace Walls removed by 2023, approximately 100 barriers remain in place as visible symbols of community segregation and division in NI. Many are high, harsh, ugly structures, while others are a mix of gates, mesh fencing and solid walls. Peace Walls are symbolic of division in many regions of conflict but, 21 years after the Good Friday/Belfast Peace Agreement, visitors to Northern Ireland are often shocked to see such visible segregation still in place.

The Berlin Wall, a solid 3.6m wall was removed 28 years ago having been in place for that same length of time; the iconic 6m high wall on the Palestinian West Bank was erected 19 years ago and remains in place in an area of overt conflict; the most visited Peace Wall in Northern Ireland, Cupar Way in West Belfast, is 14m high and has been in place for 50 years.

The International Fund for Ireland (the Fund) recognises that considerable work is required to deliver significant changes around barriers. Its local Peace Walls Programme continues to deliver well-received community engagement work in efforts to build the confidence necessary to envisage the physical and security change that would support barrier removal, reduction or de-classification. Local change is happening gradually and at a pace often not reciprocated by stakeholder agencies. The Fund is confident that, with appropriate statutory resources and commitment to this work, much more can be achieved in the coming period to improve the experience of those living in the shadows of Peace Walls.

By way of context, almost all peace barriers are located between communities that have already suffered the worst of our conflict, are continuing to experience conflict-related tensions and divisions, often compounded by coercive controls. Most live with very high levels of multiple deprivation in interface areas that lack the significant inward investment and regeneration support that they deserve.

The Fund has supported the six Peace Walls groups since 2012 to deliver community engagement and confidence building work to enable change at a pace residents are comfortable with. We cannot deliver the physical changes needed, that is for those that own the barriers, but we will work in partnership with agencies and others to achieve further change to benefit the local communities impacted.

In 2017, the Fund completed a Baseline Attitudinal Survey across its six Peace Walls areas. This Report reflects the composite findings of the updated 2019 Attitudinal Survey across the same areas. It is significant in that it evidences much positive work ongoing within and between interface communities impacted by barriers. Many communities are actively considering and working for change. It gives direction for moving forward and encourages the Peace Walls groups to enhance efforts to enable change and regeneration through partnership working where the needs of communities come first. The new Aftercare Package will enable changes at several sites in the coming period. It is hoped that guidelines on the issue of ‘consent’ for moving change forward will be available soon to enable progress at further sites.
The Fund would like to thank those 637 local residents who gave their invaluable time to participate in the Survey process, the PW staff and volunteers who helped with the face-to-face interviews and Patricia Mullan for her work in analysing the data and compiling this comprehensive, Composite Report across the areas and for the six individual local area reports which are available from the Fund website.

Paddy Harte
Chairman, International Fund for Ireland.
A security fence at the Fountain area of Londonderry/ Derry.
Introduction

The Peace Walls Programme (PWP) is an initiative developed in 2011/12 and funded by the International Fund for Ireland (IFI) to assist communities impacted by Peace Walls and physical barriers. It aims to empower residents living in close proximity to peace barriers to reach the point where they feel ready for the dialogue necessary to consider options in relation to changes to barriers. Engagement with the PWP occurs through grassroots programmes aimed at delivering a range of confidence and relationship-building interventions within and between interface communities. These are facilitated by community representatives in collaboration with relevant statutory agencies.

Changes to Peace Walls will only proceed with the consent of local residents and this requires assurances that appropriate security measures will be in place to enable them to feel safe both in their homes and the local area. As such, an essential part of the programme is to engage with as many people as possible who live at, or in close proximity to, the Peace Walls with the aim of developing an effective, consensual approach towards the removal, reduction and/or reimagining of the Peace Walls.

The PWP conducted a Baseline Attitudinal Survey to measure attitudes of those living closest to the Peace Walls across the six PWP areas towards their eventual removal. The findings from this Survey provided area-specific information from each group which was then translated into interventions that reflected the needs of these local communities.

Two years on, this process has been repeated. Responses from this second Attitudinal Survey (2019) form the basis of this Report and are compared with the 2017 responses where appropriate. The findings provide extensive up-to-date information on the views of households living in closest proximity to the Peace Walls and act as a valuable insight into attitudes in relation to the future reduction, re-imaging, de-classification or removal of barriers. It is an important source of information, not only for guiding the future development of the PWP across the six areas, but to measure impact thus far and assess the extent to which they are meeting the key objectives of the PWP.
Background Context

When the initial IFI Baseline Attitudinal Reports were published in October 2017, the Northern Ireland Assembly had not met for just over eight months. Since then the political landscape in Northern Ireland has stagnated further. Now Northern Ireland holds an unenviable record: the longest peacetime period a democracy has spent without a functioning government. Such political dysfunction has impacted on progress towards dismantling the Peace Walls across Northern Ireland.

Policy in relation to reducing/removing Peace Walls is built on the commitment in the ‘Programme for Government’ (2011) to ‘actively seek local agreement to reduce the number of Peace Walls’ and is outlined in the ‘Together Building a United Community Strategy’ (TBUC) (2013) which addressed the continuing existence of such barriers. This Strategy was reiterated in the recently published ‘Interfaces Programme: A Framework Document’ (2019).

Within the ‘Together Building a United Community’ strategy document (TBUC), key priority No.3: ‘Our Safe Community’, identified two objectives linked directly to the Peace Walls. The first objective identified the development of a 10 year plan to ‘reduce and remove by 2023, all interface barriers’.² The remit of the Interfaces Programme Board (IPB) established to meet this objective has confined its focus to structures under the ownership of the Department of Justice (DoJ) and the NI Housing Executive. In number, ‘all’ Peace Walls relates to 59 DoJ-owned structures and a further 14 NI Housing Executive ‘owned’ structures.²

This is in contrast to figures reported by the Belfast Interface Project (BIP). In their report ‘Interface Barriers, Peacelines and Defensive Architecture’ (2017), BIP identified a much higher number - 116 barriers – remaining across Northern Ireland, detailing ownership by the DOJ, statutory bodies, those under private ownership and in cases where ownership remains unknown.³

This continuing inconsistency in what constitutes a ‘barrier’ highlights the difficulty in both monitoring the remaining number of Peace Walls across Northern Ireland and, by extension, evaluating the success of TBUC towards the removal of ‘all’ barriers.

The second objective under key priority No.3 named the intention to ‘create an ‘Interface Barrier Support Package’ (Aftercare Package) to enable the meeting of this ambitious target. The broad purpose of this support package was to deliver “reassurance and security to residents, where there has been broad agreement that the adjacent interface structure can be altered or removed”’.⁴

The IFI noted in 2018 that despite working tirelessly to build confidence within communities towards barrier reduction, re-imaging, re-classification or removal of the remaining barriers, the lack of an Aftercare Package had caused difficulties in bringing plans to fruition at several sites and communities were becoming frustrated by lack of progress, particularly when there was agreement for change.⁵
Findings from several attitudinal surveys which sought views on how Peace Walls might be removed (International Fund for Ireland, 2017; Ulster University, 2015, 2012) have consistently documented the importance of maintaining community safety in the absence of the barriers. The Aftercare Package is considered key to making progress and allaying the security fears of communities in this area as residents regularly reported that they wanted reassurances that they would be safe in their homes and alternative security/protective measures needed to be put in place to ensure this. Failure to develop an Aftercare Package and a budget for its implementation at an earlier date has had a notable impact on the confidence of communities considering barrier removal, caused a loss of faith in the overall process and has hampered the capacity of those working with communities towards the eventual removal of the Peace Walls.

The Aftercare Package was recently signed off in June 2019 by the IPB and as of August 2019, Service Level Agreements are being negotiated with Delivery Partners including the PSNI and the NI Housing Executive. The content of the Aftercare Package is not, as yet, available to residents or the PWP groups.

Political inactivity has also impacted on the delivery of ‘A Fresh Start’ - the Stormont Agreement & Implementation Plan (2015) (the Fresh Start Agreement). Within the Fresh Start Agreement, an additional £60 million was secured from the British Government to develop ‘confidence and relationship building measures’ that could create the conditions necessary to enable the removal of the Peace Walls and create a shared future. Yet in October 2018,
the First Report from the Independent Reporting Commission (IRC) noted that whilst The Executive Office (TEO) had received this particular funding to complement work under the TBUC strategy, no new strategies had yet been put in place.7

Beyond the implications of no devolved administration on the implementation of these strategies, there is also a wider political context to consider. Not only is practical progress being impacted but there is a marked lack of political focus towards the restoration of Stormont. Following the murder of journalist Lyra McKee in April 2019, there were public calls for local politicians to address the political stalemate more urgently. Although a fresh round of all-party negotiations has been ongoing since May 2019, moves towards the resolution of issues have been frustratingly slow, with many indicating that they feel there will be little progress until the issue of Brexit is resolved.

This lack of progress is strongly linked to wider political happenings across the UK since the General Election of 2017. The impending departure of the United Kingdom (UK) from the European Union has resulted in the attention of all local parties and the British and Irish governments shifting towards the potential impacts of Brexit rather than on the resolution of the impasse at Stormont. The ‘confidence and supply’ agreement between the Conservative Party and the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) since May 2017 have resulted in other local parties questioning the neutrality of the British government in any such negotiations. Divisions between London and Dublin over the direction of Brexit have impacted negatively on their capacity to bring local politicians together.

Such singular focus on Brexit has limited attempts to build a united and shared society across Northern Ireland which makes work on barrier removal much more complex and difficult. Political differences in the approach to Brexit has contributed to bringing ‘identity’ politics to the fore with the reiteration of calls to hold a ‘border poll’ should the UK ‘crash out’ of the EU without a deal. Tensions within and between communities have heightened with reports of ongoing recruitment to disaffected paramilitary groupings. This continuing uncertainty about a ‘no-deal’ Brexit and the possibility of a ‘hard border’ with the Republic of Ireland is also causing grave concern about the potential impact on people’s lives and livelihoods and has raised fears about the longer-term impact on the Peace Process and the Good Friday/Belfast Agreement.
Review of Programme to Date

Participating Organisations
Engagement with the PWP occurs through grassroots programmes aimed at developing and delivering a range of confidence and relationship-building interventions within and between interface communities. These are facilitated by community representatives in collaboration with relevant statutory agencies. Table one illustrates the six PWP areas, the facilitating community organisation and the year the project began in each area.

Table 1: Areas and Participating Organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Lead Organisation</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Upper Springfield/Black Mountain (West Belfast)</td>
<td>Black Mountain Shared Space Project</td>
<td>2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bishop Street/Fountain Estate (Londonderry/ Derry)</td>
<td>Bogside/Brandywell Initiative (BBI)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lower North Belfast</td>
<td>Duncairn Community Partnership (DCP)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Greater Whitewell</td>
<td>Greater Whitewell Community Surgery (GWCS)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lower Oldpark/Cliftonville (North Belfast)</td>
<td>The IMAGINE Project</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Ardoyne, Upper Ardoyne, Twaddell &amp; Woodvale (Upper North Belfast)</td>
<td>Twaddell, Ardoyne, Shankill Communities in Transition (TASCiT)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Area Profiles
Interface areas have been hugely affected by the ‘Troubles’ and remain typified by high levels of social deprivation and a lack of inward investment. Byrne et al. (2017) highlight research findings by Hargie et al. (2006, 2011) that illustrate a ‘double penalty’ for those living in interface areas – coupling generalised socio-economic deprivation in urban working-class areas with the additional segregation and sectarianism present in such neighbourhoods. This reality has a corresponding negative impact on both educational attainment and health inequalities. Additionally, research by Maguire et al (2016) indicated that links existed between those living in close proximity to the barriers and poorer mental health than in the general population.

The introduction of welfare reform in Northern Ireland is also impacting on already-disadvantaged communities with the growth of food banks and charity shops acting as visible signs of increasing poverty across the areas. Although Welfare Supplementary Payments currently exist in NI to mitigate loss of income, it is expected that such payments will end in March 2020 in the absence of a sitting Assembly.

Groups involved in the PWP have already noted the negative impact on many residents of zero-hour contracts and low-paid employment which have contributed to the rise in numbers of the ‘working poor’. Longer waiting times for receipt of welfare benefit
payments impacts on household income levels and paying for essential living costs. The new requirement to apply and maintain claims for Universal Credit (UC) online creates difficulties for many people in terms of access and digital literacy. The introduction of Personal Independence Payments (PIP) has also had a punitive impact on many people with complex health support needs, often related to impact of the conflict, including the rise in mental health illness which has become a much more prominent issue across all age groups since the overt conflict ended. As research by Maguire et al. (2016) noted, people living in the shadows of Peace Walls in interface areas are particularly impacted.

The six PWP areas are located across 21 separate Super Output Areas (SOAs). Northern Ireland Multiple Deprivation Measure (NIMDM) 2017 ranks 14 of these 21 SOAs in the top 10% of most deprived areas in relation to the multiple deprivation measures domain. Of these 14 SOAs, four are ranked in the top 1% of the most deprived areas, two are ranked in the top 2% of the most deprived areas and three are ranked in the top 5% of most deprived areas in relation to the multiple deprivation measures domain.

Of these 14 SOAs, all are ranked in the top 10% of most deprived areas in relation to the employment deprivation domain with four being in the top 1% in relation to this domain. Nine are ranked in the top 10% of most deprived areas in relation to the income deprivation domain with one being in the top 1% in relation to this domain. 12 are ranked in the top 10% of most deprived areas in relation to the health and disability domain with two being in the top 1% in relation to this domain. 11 are in the top 10% of most deprived areas in relation to the education, skills and training deprivation domain with two being in the top 1% in relation to this domain.

Positive attitudinal change towards the removal or reduction of interface barriers would be enhanced if strategies were developed to tackle the socio-economic conditions and health inequalities of each area with incentives for visible change created through regeneration initiatives and community benefit programmes.

**Progress to Date**

The PWP is now firmly embedded across all six participating PWP areas. Since the beginning of the Programme, there have been significant changes across all six areas with the removal of 11 barriers. Additionally, all six groups have continued efforts to re-image or reduce the barriers that remain, ‘softening’ the harshness of barriers through reduction in size and/or removing metal grills or gates and providing greater accessibility at some of the Peace Walls sites. While it is not possible to detail each change across the six areas in this short report, a summary is provided in Appendix 2 and more detailed progress accounts for each area can be accessed in their individual area reports, available from each group or from the IFI website.

All participating groups report that success to date has only been possible due to their focus on engaging with as many residents as possible to agree to such changes. This underlines the importance of the approach taken by the IFI PWP that the pace of change towards barrier removal/reduction must be led by community consent. The participating projects continue to engage with residents in their respective areas in a number of ways. These include:
• organising community surveys and meetings to discuss proposals relating to change at the Peace Walls;
• working with communities to break down negative perceptions of their neighbours on the other side of the Peace Wall through a range of community engagement activities;
• identifying and discussing safety concerns and working with both agencies and residents to allay fears and build confidence;
• developing visioning tools and ‘concept’ designs to illustrate what proposed changes would look like in real physical terms and aid discussions about potential change;
• facilitating ‘best practice’ visits to areas where change has occurred to illustrate how space currently occupied by the Peace Walls could be utilised for local community benefit; and
• facilitating cross-community programmes in order to build relationships and develop a ‘sense of community’ that is inclusive of all residents.

All Peace Walls Programmes remain conscious of sensitivities regarding past violence in these areas and how this impacts attitudes to barrier removal. Their approach concentrates on encouraging conversations about feelings of vulnerability and enables the PWP groups to address concerns and reassure residents that no change will occur which might compromise safety or security. It also offers opportunities to hear critical voices and dispel myths that change will happen without community consent.

Furthermore, this engagement deepens trust and builds the confidence of local residents to engage in conversations about changes to the barriers in a ‘natural’ way rather than focusing on Peace Walls removal per se. Such conversations focus on how best to develop realistic and deliverable proposals and encourage the breakdown of the mental barriers that can often stymie progress. This approach demonstrates in practical terms how proposed changes to the barriers could be beneficial in terms of improved quality of life and attract wider community benefits. It empowers local communities to adopt ownership of the proposals as they become more active in shaping these and articulating ideas for what they want to see changed in their area. By placing an onus on ‘change that is possible’, residents are more willing to take steps towards change and maintain their involvement in the work of the PWP.

However, all six participating projects have noted that the absence of the Aftercare Package to date has had a direct impact on change to barriers at several sites. This has had a knock-on effect on securing further agreement on reduction of barriers from other residents. Full implementation of the proposed Aftercare Package should enable progress at some sites in the coming period.

Delays with implementing decisions that have already gained community consent have also caused tension and frustration for residents in some instances, with many reporting feeling ‘let down’ and ‘having their hopes dashed’. This has led to some residents questioning the capacity of the lead department, the DoJ, and other statutory bodies to deliver on the TBUC commitments in the absence of a functioning Executive and Assembly from which the directive came. Working towards barrier removal is already difficult but compounded when local communities give consent to changes that are then not implemented.
There are also expressed concerns relating to the rise in anti-social behavior (ASB) and, in some instances, arranged fights between transient gangs of young people, across several of the PWP areas over the past two years. These have had a subsequent impact on feelings of safety within the surrounding communities. Limited resources for neighbourhood policing and a subsequent lack of visible police presence across these areas makes it more difficult to mitigate such behavior. All six PWP groups continue to work with other local groups, agencies and the PSNI to address this issue. However, after several inter-agency meetings, all groups expressed growing concern about the continued lack of a policing strategy to tackle the issue.

The organisations involved in the PWP have continued to build and maintain good working relationships with a range of elected representatives from across the political spectrum and with statutory bodies including the DoJ, the NIHE, the PSNI and local Council officials. Additionally, continuity and the long-term commitment by staff involved in the PWP have been important to building trust and maintaining relationships with residents. The development of closer working partnership-working between all six organisations involved in the PWP has strengthened their voice and capacity to take forward the aims of the Peace Walls Programme.
About this Report

This Report outlines the findings from the Community Attitudes to Peace Walls Survey (2019) across the six PWP areas and compares them with the 2017 Survey results where appropriate.

This Report follows the definition given by the Belfast Interface Project that the term ‘interface barrier’ is “any physical barrier in an interface area that is designed to provide protection or security to residents and property.” (BIP, 2017:6) This includes walls, fences and gates and other barriers or structures between Protestant/Unionist/Loyalist (PUL) areas and Catholic/Nationalist/Republican (CNR) areas. The terms ‘Peace Walls’, ‘barriers’ and ‘structures’ will be used interchangeably throughout the Report.

Survey Aims & Objectives

The aim of this Report is to provide an overview of attitudes towards the Peace Walls from the perspective of households most impacted due to living in close proximity to the barriers.

The objectives of the Survey were to:
• gather and analyse attitudinal positions of residents from both communities within the area;
• provide PWP staff with area-specific information to aid the development of future initiatives that reflect community attitudes;
• compare this profile with baseline data gathered in 2017 in order to measure attitudinal change in the area between 2017 and 2019; and
• identify potential issues of concern that need to be addressed in order to deliver the wider outcomes of the PWP, namely that ‘interface communities have confidence in and a positive attitude to barrier reduction and/or removal’.

Survey Content

The Survey explored community attitudes in relation to the Peace Walls under four main themes, namely:
• opinion on the area as a place to live, current issues of concern and how/if these are related to the presence of the barriers;
• views on the role of the Peace Walls/barriers including views on their function(s) and perceptions of their positives and negative aspects;
• interaction with the ’other’ community including how often and where people meet and opinions on nature of such interaction (positive/negative); and
• preferences for the future status of the Peace Walls and an exploration of what is needed in this community to enable progress towards the reduction, re-imaging, re-classification or removal of the remaining barriers.

Sampling Design & Survey Implementation

The defined population for the study was residents aged 16 and over who were considered most impacted by the barriers due to their proximity to the Peace Walls as identified by the PWP groups. Sampling was completed by PWP staff and volunteers using their extensive
Participants from the Imagine Project in North Belfast
knowledge from working and living in the local areas. Postcodes were assigned to each identified barrier and the surrounding households. These households then became the Survey target group. PWP staff took responsibility for the primary data collection through face-to-face interviews with respondents. Residents did not receive any incentive to participate in the fieldwork.

**Response Rate**
The total sample across the six PWP areas was 1,222 households. Of these 637 households completed the Survey. The response rate was 52%.

**Data Preparation & Presentation**
Data was inputted into IBM SPSS Statistics 24 prior to analysis. Tables of key findings below are presented with the average responses from respondents across the six PWP areas. Data was analysed in relation to the total number of respondents (n=637) and in relation to community background. Findings directly comparative with those in the 2017 Baseline Survey are provided to illustrate change in attitudes. Findings in the Report are valid percentages and presented in whole numbers.

**Demographics of Respondents**
Table 2 shows the demographics of respondents to the Survey, stratified by gender, age and community background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Respondents (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Categories</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Adults (16 – 64)</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adults (65+)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNR</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUL</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

The purpose of this Survey was to provide the PWP with an updated overview of attitudes towards the Peace Walls from the perspective of those most impacted as a result of living in close proximity to them. Where applicable, findings are compared with those from 2017 in order to measure attitudinal change. These findings indicate the opportunities to make further progress towards meeting the overall aims of the PWP and identify the challenges in doing so. For the purpose of the Composite Report, data was analysed in relation to the total number of respondents (n=637) and in relation to community background and an average score was produced across the six PWP areas. For ease of reporting ‘all respondents’ refers to ‘all respondents (on average)’ and ‘all respondents from a CNR/PUL background’ refers to ‘all respondents (on average) from a CNR/PUL background’ throughout.

Community Safety & Local Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Finding 1: Reported issues of local concern were not in the main linked to the barriers and feelings of safety were reported at high levels. Anti-social behaviour is a growing issue of local concern and both communities would value additional policing resources to address this.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>86% of all respondents either felt ‘very safe’ or ‘fairly safe’ living in their areas in comparison to 80% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17% of all respondents reported that their issues of concern were linked to the barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44% of all respondents reported that they currently had no ‘issues of concern’ about the local area in comparison to 26% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34% of all respondents reported anti-social behaviour (including misuse of drugs) as the key issue of local concern in comparison to 10% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81% of PUL respondents reported that they felt ‘very safe or ‘fairly safe’ living in the area in comparison to 89% of CNR respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35% of PUL respondents reported anti-social behaviour (including misuse of drugs) as the key issue of local concern in comparison to 13% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33% of CNR respondents reported anti-social behaviour (including misuse of drugs) as the key issue of local concern in comparison to 7% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48% of CNR respondents reported that additional neighbourhood policing (to tackle ASB) would have a positive impact on attitudinal change to the removal of the barriers as did 42% of PUL respondents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall respondents feel ‘safe’ living in the PWP areas with 86% reporting feeling ‘fairly safe’ or ‘very safe’. This is an increase from an already high baseline figure of 80% in 2017. These reported levels of safety are linked 44% of all respondents reporting that they have ‘no concerns’ about issues in the local area compared to a much lower 26% in 2017 Survey findings.

However, a rise in anti-social behavior (ASB) is an increasingly prominent issue of concern across all six PWP areas with over one-third (34%) of all respondents identifying it as the main issue of local concern compared to only 10% in 2017 Survey findings. This is an issue impacting on both communities with 35% of PUL respondents reporting it as their main concern and a near-identical 33% of CNR respondents doing likewise. Almost half (48%)
of CNR respondents and 42% of PUL respondents identified that additional community policing (to tackle ASB) would have a positive impact on attitudinal change to the removal of the Peace Walls.

Prior to the community survey being carried out, all six PWP groups had noted their awareness that ASB and 'arranged fights among young people' were a growing issue across their areas and that they were working with the PSNI and other concerned groups to mitigate the impact of its effect on community safety. However, it should be noted that reduced neighbourhood policing resources and a lack of continuity in PSNI personnel makes it more difficult to build relationships and to develop a coherent policing strategy that would have local community buy-in to effectively tackle this issue. The data suggests that respondents across both communities would value the targeting of greater resources towards addressing ASB and indicates that failure to do so could have implications for progressing the wider aims of the PWP given that local fears for safety and security are increasing. Local perception is often that the ASB/arranged fights are sectarian in nature, which to date has not been the case, but there is always concern that this issue will develop as gatherings often take place on the derelict land around interfaces.

Current Views on the Peace Walls

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Finding 2: Respondents continue to view the functions and positives of the barriers in terms of safety and security but there is evidence of growing ambivalence towards the barriers and both communities would welcome alternative security arrangements.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58% of all respondents reported that the main function of the barriers was related to ‘safety and security’ in comparison to 54% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% of all respondents felt that the main positive aspects of the barriers related to ‘safety and security’ in comparison to 75% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18% of all respondents that the barriers had ‘no function’ in comparison to 13% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% of all respondents that the barriers had ‘no positives’ in comparison to 16% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36% of all respondents reported that additional security for their area would have a positive impact on attitudinal change to the removal of the barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31% of all respondents reported that additional security for property would have a positive impact on attitudinal change to the removal of the barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63% of CNR respondents reported that the main function of the barriers was related to ‘safety and security’ in comparison to 49% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58% of PUL respondents reported that the main function of the barriers was related to ‘safety and security’ in comparison to 62% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68% of CNR respondents reported that the main positive aspects of the barriers related to ‘safety and security’ in comparison to 71% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% of PUL respondents reported that the main positive aspects of the barriers related to ‘safety and security’ in comparison to 79% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% of CNR respondents reported that the barriers had ‘no function’ and 28% that they had no ‘positives’ in comparison to 18% and 22% respectively in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15% of PUL respondents reported that the barriers had ‘no function’ and 16% that they had no ‘positives’ in comparison to 7% and 9% respectively in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36% of PUL respondents reported that additional security for the area would have a positive impact on attitudinal change to the removal of the barriers as did 20% of CNR respondents.

33% of PUL respondents reported that additional security for property would have a positive impact on attitudinal change to the removal of the barriers as did 26% of CNR respondents.

The Peace Walls across Northern Ireland were first constructed as a response to inter-community sectarian violence or security concerns and were a means of ‘protecting people and property’. The data indicates that many respondents across the six PWP areas continue to view the functions of the Peace Walls as existing for this initial purpose with 58% of all respondents reporting that the main function of the barriers related to ‘safety and security’ in comparison to 54% in 2017 Survey findings.

Additionally, 68% of all respondents continued to view the ‘positives’ of the barriers in relation to their safety and security mechanisms. These included ‘protecting people and property’ (30%), ‘making people feel safer’ (24%) and ‘keeping the peace/preventing trouble’ (14%). Although this has declined from three-quarters (75%) of all respondents in 2017 Survey findings, the data suggest that the barriers remain a trusted form of ‘protection’ by both communities. Three-quarters (75%) of PUL respondents reported that the main ‘positive’ aspects of the barriers related to ‘safety and security’ as did 68% of CNR respondents. This continuing mindset across both communities that the Peace Walls play a positive role in enhancing community safety presents a challenge to the PWP in that alternatives to the barriers must be found that are acceptable to residents.

However, there is also evidence in the data that there is a slowly growing belief that the existence of the barriers is now ‘less’ necessary. Almost one-fifth (18%) of all respondents reporting they had ‘no function’ and one-quarter (25%) of all respondents reporting they had ‘no positives’ in comparison to 13% and 16% respectively in 2017 Survey findings. Importantly, this is present across both communities. 28% of CNR respondents reported that the barriers have ‘no positives’ in comparison to 22% in 2017 Survey findings. Respondents from the PUL community also reported an increase, albeit from a lower baseline of 9% (2017) to 16% (2019). This finding suggests there is potential for future positive attitudinal change towards barrier removal were alternative security mechanisms to be put in place across the six PWP areas.

The data also indicates that respondents are ‘open’ to considering alternative security arrangements with 36% of all respondents identifying ‘improved security in the area’ as having the potential for positive attitudinal change towards barrier removal and 31% reporting ‘improved security for property’ as having the same. This was more strongly reported by the PUL community with 36% identifying the former and 33% the latter. CNR respondents also identified these factors as having potential to impact upon attitudes towards the barriers with 20% identifying the former and 26% identifying the latter.

The Attitudinal Survey Summary of Results (2017) Report highlighted that the provision of ‘alternative and adequate security arrangements’ was essential to changing the prevailing mindset across all six PWP areas that the barriers were inextricably linked to maintaining community safety. These findings suggest that the absence of the Aftercare Package has had
a direct impact on countering this belief and that respondents continue to express safety concerns that need to be addressed through confidence-building measures that increase security at their homes and environs, coupled with assurance of aftercare support from agencies, including the PSNI, should attacks to property happen. The implementation of the proposed Aftercare Package across all six areas in the coming period should have a corresponding impact on how residents view the barriers in terms of community safety and become an enabler for greater progress towards their eventual removal.

Key Finding 3: There is recognition that retention of the barriers will have negative impacts at both an individual and community level.

- 27% of all respondents stated that the negatives of the barriers are that they are ‘ugly’ and ‘stereotype’ their areas in comparison to 22% in 2017 Survey findings
- 77% of all respondents stated that retention of the barriers would have a negative impact on external perceptions of the areas
- 71% of all respondents stated that retention of the barriers would have a negative impact on property values in the areas
- 68% of all respondents stated that retention of the barriers would have a negative impact on insurance costs in the areas
- 67% of all respondents stated that retention of the barriers would have a negative impact on health and well-being of residents
- 45% of all respondents stated that additional employment opportunities would promote greater attitudinal change to removal of the barriers
- 40% of all respondents stated that additional community facilities would promote greater attitudinal change to removal of the barriers
- 38% of all respondents stated that greater development of housing (in waste land) would promote greater attitudinal change to removal of the barriers
- 76% of all respondents were strongly in favour of the barriers being removed within the lifetime of their children or grandchildren in comparison to 68% in 2017 Survey findings.

Although respondents continued to view the ‘positives’ of the barriers in relation to their safety and security mechanisms, there is evidence of a growing recognition that the barriers impact negatively on external perceptions of the areas and that retention of the barriers will have subsequent negative impacts at both an individual and community level.

In addition to one-quarter (25%) of all respondents reporting the barriers had ‘no positives’, 27% of all respondents stated that the main negatives of the barriers were that they were ‘ugly’ and ‘stereotyped’ their areas in comparison to 22% in 2017 Survey findings. Additionally, over three-quarters (77%) of all respondents stated that retention of the barriers would have a negative impact on external perceptions of the areas.

There is also evidence in the data that respondents believe that retention of the barriers would have negative impacts at an individual level. Seven-in-ten (71%) of all respondents stated that retention of the barriers would have a negative impact on property values in the areas with a similar 68% of stating that they would have a negative impact on insurance costs in the areas. Over two-thirds (67%) of all respondents stated that retention of the barriers would have a negative impact on the health and well-being of residents.
Barriers on houses in North Belfast
The findings suggest a growing awareness amongst respondents that attitudinal change towards barrier removal is partially dependent on socio-economic change, greater inward investment and regeneration and this is reflected across all six PWP areas. 45% of all respondents stated that additional employment opportunities would promote greater attitudinal change to removal of the barriers. 40% of all respondents reported that additional community facilities would do likewise and a near-identical 38% of all respondents stated that greater development of housing would have a positive impact on attitudes.

This indication of a growing awareness that the presence of the barriers brings ‘negatives’ as well as ‘positives’ provides the PWP groups with an opportunity to highlight their ongoing regeneration work and future aspirations for same across the six areas. This finding also suggests that the PWP groups should continue advocating for positive physical changes in terms of land-use at barrier sites with an onus on how space currently occupied by the Peace Walls could be developed to bring wider local community benefits. However, this is tempered with the reality that this cannot be delivered in isolation by the PWP groups and that wider socio-economic changes to the areas will require greater inter-agency collaboration and cross-party political leadership and support.

Interaction & Community Relations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Finding 4: Quantity and quality of regular interaction with the ‘other’ community and those on the other side of the Peace Walls has grown in both communities since 2017.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>57% of all respondents stated that interaction with the ‘other’ community occurred ‘very often’ or ‘fairly often’ in comparison to 51% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of all respondents reported they had regular contact with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ in comparison to 26% in 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% of all respondents stated that interaction with the ‘other’ community occurred ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ in comparison to 29% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36% of all respondents stated that interaction with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ occurred ‘rarely’ or ‘never’ in comparison to 53% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78% of all respondents reported that interaction with the ‘other’ community was ‘always’ or ‘mostly’ positive in comparison with 71% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67% of all respondents reported that interaction with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ was ‘always’ or ‘mostly’ positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% of all respondents reported that retention of the barriers would have a negative impact on community relations in comparison to 66% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28% of all respondents reported that a ‘negative’ of the barriers was that they ‘keep the two communities apart’ and ‘prevent normalisation’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44% of all respondents reported that ‘attitudinal change towards the other’ and/or ‘greater cross-community/good relations’ work would impact positively on attitudinal change to the barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54% of PUL respondents stated that interaction with the ‘other’ community occurred ‘very often’ or ‘fairly often’ in comparison to 48% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59% of CNR respondents stated that interaction with the ‘other’ community occurred ‘very often’ or ‘fairly often’ in comparison to 53% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
40% of PUL respondents reported they had regular contact with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ in comparison to 29% in 2017.

40% of CNR respondents reported they had regular contact with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ in comparison to 23% in 2017.

77% of PUL respondents reported that interaction with the ‘other’ community was ‘always’ or ‘mostly’ positive in comparison with 66% in 2017 Survey findings.

80% of CNR respondents reported that interaction with the ‘other’ community was ‘always’ or ‘mostly’ positive in comparison with 74% in 2017 Survey findings.

64% of PUL respondents reported that interaction with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ was ‘always’ or ‘mostly’ positive as did 70% of CNR respondents.

This finding clearly illustrates that there has been measurable and positive change in relation to both regular and irregular interaction levels with the ‘other’ community and with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ across the six PWP areas since 2017.

57% of all respondents stated that interaction with the ‘other’ community occurred on a ‘regular’ (very/fairly often) basis in comparison to 51% in 2017 Survey findings. Respondents also reported a decline in ‘irregular’ interaction with the ‘other’ community with 19% of all respondents stating ‘rare’ or ‘no’ interaction in comparison to 29% in 2017 Survey findings.

There was a noteworthy increase in ‘regular’ interaction with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Walls’ with 40% of all respondents reporting this in comparison to 26% in 2017 Survey findings. The data also indicates that the PWP groups have been successful in addressing ‘irregular’ interaction levels highlighted in the Attitudinal Survey Summary of Results (2017) with 36% of all respondents now reporting ‘irregular’ interaction in comparison to a much higher 53% in 2017 Survey findings.

Both communities increased their levels of ‘regular’ interaction with the ‘other’ community since 2017 with 54% of PUL respondents stated that this occurred ‘very often’ or ‘fairly often’ (2017=48%) and 59% of CNR respondents doing likewise (2017=53%). Both communities displayed noteworthy changes in ‘regular’ interaction levels with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ with 40% of both PUL and CNR respondents reporting regular interaction in 2019 in comparison to 29% and 23% respectively in 2017 Survey findings.

Moreover, when interaction with the ‘other’ community did happen, respondents expressed the opinion that it was an overwhelmingly positive experience with no respondents reporting that interaction was ‘always’ negative. Starting from an already high baseline in 2017 when 71% of all respondents reporting that interaction was ‘always’ or ‘mostly’ positive, these figures increased to 78%. There was near-identical reporting by the two communities with 77% of respondents from the PUL community reporting this (2017=66%) and 80% of CNR respondents doing the same (2017=74%). Additionally, there was no stark differences as regards ‘quality’ of interaction with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ with over two-thirds (67%) of all respondents reported that such interaction was ‘always’ or ‘mostly’ positive.
42% of all respondents reported meeting at community events which had increased from 35% in 2017 Survey findings. Three in ten (30%) of all respondents reported meeting at PWP-facilitated events. Such high engagement at places of ‘choice’ that specifically encourage cross-community interaction is a positive finding for the PWP. So too is the awareness that the barriers have negative impacts on community relations with 28% of all respondents reporting that a ‘negative’ of the barriers was that they ‘keep the two communities apart’ and ‘prevent normalisation’ and 70% of all respondents reporting that retention of the barriers would impact negatively upon community relations.

These findings clearly demonstrate the value of the work undertaken by the PWP groups to facilitate events on a cross-community basis and build relationships between residents on either side of the barriers over the past two years. As 44% of all respondents reported that ‘attitudinal change towards the other’ and/or ‘greater cross-community/good relations’ work would impact positively on attitudinal change to the barriers, the PWP groups should continue their focus on raising engagement levels and building understanding and trust between the two communities in order to progress the wider aims of the PWP.

Looking to the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Finding 5: There is positive attitudinal change towards the removal of the barriers since 2017 across both communities although those from the CNR community favour change at a faster pace.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19% of all respondents reported that they want the barriers to be removed ‘now’ in comparison to 13% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29% of all respondents reported that they want the barriers to be removed ‘sometime in the future’ in comparison to 31% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% of all respondents reported that they want to see greater accessibility, re-imaging or reclassification of the barriers in comparison to 28% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19% of all respondents reported that they want ‘no change’ in comparison to 25% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76% of all respondents were strongly in favour of the barriers being removed within the lifetime of their children or grandchildren in comparison to 68% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% of all respondents were uncertain that they could envisage a time when there were no segregation barriers in comparison to 19% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% of CNR respondents wanted to see the barriers come down ‘now’ in comparison to 18% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37% of CNR respondents wanted to see the barriers come down at ‘sometime’ in the future which was reported at the same level in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24% of CNR respondents reported that they want to see greater accessibility, re-imaging or declassification of the barriers in comparison to 20% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12% of CNR respondents wanted to retain the status quo in comparison to 23% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% of CNR respondents were strongly in favour of the barriers being removed within the lifetime of their children or grandchildren in comparison to 73% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% of CNR respondents were uncertain that they could envisage a time when there were no segregation barriers in comparison to 16% in 2017 Survey findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12% of PUL respondents wanted to see the barriers come down ‘now’ in comparison to 7% in 2017 Survey findings

21% of PUL respondents wanted to see the barriers come down at ‘sometime’ in the future in comparison to 24% in 2017 Survey findings

39% of PUL respondents reported that they want to see greater accessibility, re-imaging or declassification of the barriers in comparison to 37% in 2017 Survey findings

26% of PUL respondents wanted to retain the status quo in comparison to 29% in 2017 Survey findings respondents

72% of PUL respondents were strongly in favour of the barriers being removed within the lifetime of their children or grandchildren in comparison to 62% in 2017 Survey findings

23% of PUL respondents were uncertain that they could envisage a time when there were no segregation barriers in comparison to 21% in 2017 Survey findings.

The data suggest a gradual and positive direction in attitudinal change towards barrier removal for the PWP across all six areas. Almost four-fifths (78%) of all respondents want to see change to the barriers in some form in comparison to 72% in 2017 Survey findings. Almost one-fifth (19%) wish to see the barriers being removed ‘now’ in comparison to a lower 13% in 2017 Survey findings. Additionally, 29% wish to see them removed at
‘sometime’ in the future (2017=31%) and 30% are open to incremental change, be that reimagining, greater accessibility or declassification (2017=28%). Almost one-fifth (19%) of all respondents wish to retain the status quo at this time but this has declined from one-quarter (25%) of all respondents in 2017 Survey findings.

There was also a strongly expressed hope that permanent change could happen within the next two generations with more than three-quarters (76%) of all respondents reporting that they did not want to see the barriers retained in the lives of their children or grandchildren. This was an increase from an already high baseline of 68% in 2017 Survey findings.

However, the data also suggests that there exists a level of uncertainty across the six PWP areas regarding how barrier removal can be progressed now. This is illustrated by 30% of all respondents reporting they were ‘unsure’ if they could envisage a time without the barriers in comparison to a much lower 19% in 2017 Survey findings. These findings suggest that even though the majority of respondents continue to want to see change to the barriers in some form, a lack of progress at sites where community consent has been given but change has not happened may have had a knock-on effect on confidence levels on how change can be implemented. These findings suggest that there is a need for greater clarity in what constitutes ‘community consent’ and further inter-agency working to ensure that when changes are agreed that they are implemented swiftly.

When stratified by community identity, the overall data is suggestive that the CNR community is embracing change towards the removal of the Peace Walls at a faster pace than the PUL community but there is strengthening of views across both communities regarding change in the future.

More than one-fifth (22%) of CNR respondents reported that they wish to see change to the barriers ‘now’ in comparison to 18% in 2017 Survey findings. A further 37% of the CNR community wanted to see them removed at ‘sometime in the future’. Only 12% of CNR respondents wished to retain the status quo in comparison to 23% in 2017 Survey findings. Over one-quarter (26%) of CNR respondents were content to see continuing incremental changes to the barriers including greater accessibility (10%), re-imaging (8%) or declassification (8%).

The data suggests that whilst the PUL community is more cautious about embracing immediate change to the Peace Walls, it is more open to considering change than in 2017 with 12% reporting that they wish to see change to the barriers ‘now’ in comparison to 7% in 2017 Survey findings. A further 21% of the PUL community wanted to see them removed at ‘sometime in the future’. Over one-quarter (26%) of PUL respondents wished to retain the status quo which had declined slightly from 29% in 2017 Survey findings. 39% of PUL respondents were content to see continuing incremental changes to the barriers including re-imaging (18%) greater accessibility (16%) or declassification (5%). This finding provides a clear direction for the PWP regarding the approach to progress which is favoured by this community.
The findings also indicate that hope for change exists across both communities for 
permanent change in reference to future generations. 85% of CNR respondents wish to 
see the barriers being removed in the lifetimes of their children and/or grandchildren as 
do 72% of PUL respondents. This desire for future permanent change has increased across 
both communities since 2017 when 73% of CNR respondents and 62% of PUL respondents 
reported this. This finding suggests that neither community wishes to see the long-term 
retention of the barriers but that further confidence building is necessary to convince 
residents that removal of the barriers will bring positive transformation of their areas and 
not compromise community safety.

The Survey data provides clear evidence of positive attitudinal change across both 
communities towards the removal of the barriers across the six PWP areas since the initial 
Baseline Survey was carried out in 2017. There is also growing support for immediate 
change to the barriers and strong evidence that both communities want change for future 
generations. These findings are positive for the PWP when viewed in the wider context of 
political instability in Northern Ireland, uncertainty about ‘Brexit’ and the absence of the 
Aftercare Package that has existed since 2017.
Conclusion

The 2019 Survey data provides clear evidence of positive attitudinal change in both the PUL and CNR communities towards the removal of barriers in the six PWP areas since the initial Baseline Survey carried out in 2017. There is growing support for immediate change to the barriers, lessening support for retaining the status quo and stronger evidence that both communities are open to greater change in the future. Both communities also express strengthened hopes for change regarding future generations. There has been measurable change in relation to interaction levels, particularly with reference to interaction and engagement with those living on ‘the other side of the Peace Walls’. Additionally, there are indications in the data of a growing awareness that retention of the barriers would have negative impacts at both an individual and community level and that barrier removal could impact positively on improving inequalities in socio-economic conditions in these areas. However, challenges remain regarding views expressed that continue to link ‘community safety’ to the presence of the barriers.

The Attitudinal Survey Summary of Results (2017) Report highlighted that the continuing issue of community safety and the corresponding mindset of residents that this was linked to the presence of the barriers presented a challenge to progressing the work of the IFI PWP across interface areas. Two years on, the data suggests that although respondents report higher levels of ‘feeling safe’ in the areas in which they live, this issue has not been resolved with a subsequent continuation of the view that the ‘functions’ and ‘positives’ of the barriers are linked to maintaining safety and security of residents. Countering this remains a challenge for the IFI PWP.
However, the data also indicates greater levels of awareness that the barriers bring ‘negatives’ as well as positives and a greater willingness to consider ‘alternatives’ to the barriers should appropriate safety and security arrangements be put in place. This is a positive finding for the Programme in that, even in the absence of detail regarding the proposed Aftercare Package, positive attitudinal change towards barrier removal has continued. The Aftercare Package has now been agreed at DOJ level and the findings suggest that the implementation of this across all six areas in the near future should have a corresponding impact on how residents view the barriers in terms of community safety. Such implementation should become an enabler for greater progress towards their eventual removal.

A further challenge for the IFI PWP is the evidence within the data of growing concern about levels of anti-social behaviour (ASB) across the six areas which could have a corresponding negative impact on people feeling safe in their communities. Whilst the PWP groups have continued to work with the PSNI and other concerned local organisations to mitigate the impacts of this issue, reduced neighbourhood policing resources makes it more difficult to develop the coherent strategies needed to effectively manage this issue in and across the areas. The data suggests that respondents across both communities would value the targeting of greater policing resources towards addressing ASB and that this is an important element to building community confidence and progressing the wider aims of the PWP.

The Attitudinal Survey Summary of Results (2017) Report also highlighted the need to encourage improved inter-community relationships and trust particularly between communities living on either side of the Peace Walls. Since 2017, there has been measurable and positive change in relation to both regular and irregular interaction levels with the ‘other’ community and with the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’ across the six PWP areas. Furthermore, such interaction is considered positively and there are no stark differences in the ‘quality’ of interaction between the ‘other’ community in general and the community on the ‘other side of the Peace Wall’. This is a positive finding for IFI PWP as it indicates that the PWP groups have successfully developed greater trust and relationships on a cross-community basis over the past two years which is essential to developing greater community consensus and confidence in achieving barrier removal.

The data indicates a growing support for immediate change to the barriers, a lessening of support for retaining the status quo and stronger evidence that both communities are open to greater change in the future. This finding is extremely important for the IFI PWP in that, even in the context of limited political focus on building a united and shared society across Northern Ireland in the past two years, there has been measurable positive attitudinal change towards barrier removal across the six PWP areas. The findings also illustrate a stronger desire for permanent change in reference to future generations which indicates that both communities have a greater determination to resolve the issues that impede progress towards barrier removal so that their children and/or grandchildren do not have to live with them.
That said, the data also suggests a level of uncertainty across the six PWP areas in relation to how barrier removal can be progressed at present. This may be due in part to the wider political instability in Northern Ireland but it also indicates that greater progress could be made if there was greater clarity regarding what constitutes ‘community consent’ and more focused inter-agency work to ensure that the necessary resources and support are put in place as quickly as possible when changes are agreed at a local level. Absence of agreed guidance on what constitutes community consent gives a veto to those who do not wish to see change and who, in some instances, are actively blocking positive change.

In 2017, there were indications that communities living in closest proximity to the barriers needed to be convinced that reduction, re-imaging, or removal of the barriers would create wider community benefits. The findings in 2019 indicate a growing awareness that retention of the barriers would have negative impacts at an individual and community level and on external perceptions of these areas. This finding indicates that on-going work by the PWP groups to illustrate how change to the barriers could aid transformation of the area is having impact. Current and future regeneration projects, including the development of employment opportunities, better access to services and transport, new housing and community facilities/amenities across the six PWP areas should address wider socio-economic inequalities and have a corresponding impact on positive attitudinal change to the barriers. However, this finding underscores the reality that such ‘holistic’ change cannot be delivered in isolation by the PWP groups and requires greater inter-agency commitment, collaboration and cross-party political leadership in moving forward.

Given that all of the PWP areas experience high levels of multiple deprivation, have been significantly impacted by the conflict, continue to live with its legacy, with residents having to live in the shadow of Peace Walls while grappling with the issues/problems they bring, it is not unreasonable to suggest that they deserve greater statutory focus and investment, with political support, in the coming period if significant progress is to be made on the delivery of TBUC 2023.
Appendix
Appendix 1: Community Attitudes to Peace Walls Survey (2019)

Peace Walls Programme
Community Attitudes to Peace Walls Survey (2019)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Peace Walls Project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location of Peace Walls/Barrier/Gate: Identify PW barrier closest to street being surveyed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street name and post code:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street profile: circle as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey form completed by:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section One: You & Your Area

| Q1 | Age group – circle answer in box: 16/24; 25/44; 45/64; 65 plus |
| Q2 | Gender – circle answer in box: Male Female Other |
| Q3 | Length of time living in the area (approx) |
| Q4 | Number in household (include yourself) |
| Q5 | Have you other family living in the area? Yes / No |
| Q6 | Are there any issues in your area causing you concern? Detail: |
| Q7 | Are any of these concerns linked to your nearest Peace Wall/barrier/gate? Detail: |

Section Two: Views On The Peace Walls/Barriers

| Q8 | Which Peace Wall/Barrier/Gate do you live closest to? |
| Q9 | What do you think is the main function of your nearest Peace Wall/barrier/gate? (One answer only) |

Name of PW/B/G: |
Approx distance: |
Q10: How safe do you feel living close to this Peace Wall/Barrier/Gate?  
1 is very unsafe and 10 is very safe  (Please circle one answer only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q11: What contributes to your feelings of safety or unsafety?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What makes you feel safe about living close to the Peace Barrier?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What makes you feel unsafe about living close to the Peace Barrier?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| My safety is not affected by living close to the Peace Barrier |

Q12: What do you think are the positive and negative impacts of Peace Walls/barriers/gates in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Negatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q13: are you aware of any alterations to the Peace Wall/barrier/gates and what impact has this had? Detail:
Section Three: Interaction with the ‘other’ Community
Applies to Q14 and Q15:  A: General inter-community contact
B: Contact with community on the other side of nearest Peace Wall/barrier/gate

Q14: How often do you interact with people outside of your own community background? (Please circle one answer on each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q15: Is the interaction with the other community positive or negative? (Please circle one answer on each row)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always positive</th>
<th>Mostly positive</th>
<th>Neither Pos/Neg</th>
<th>Mostly Negative</th>
<th>Always Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q16: Where do you meet people from the other community? (Tick all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Shops</th>
<th>Creche/nursery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School/college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Group event</td>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>Health Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace Walls Good Relations event</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>Other (specify)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Four: Imagining The Future

Q17: Thinking about Peace Walls/barriers/gates, tick one box that comes closest to what you would want for your area?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I would like the Peace barrier to come down now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the Peace barrier to come down at some time in the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like things left the way they are now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to keep the Peace barrier, but have it opened for accessibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep the peace barrier, but change it to make it look more appealing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De-classify/normalise the Peace barrier as it no longer serves that purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
Q18: Can you picture a time when there will be no Peace Walls in your area? Circle as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>If yes, comment on when/why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q19: Would you like your children or grandchildren to live with barriers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>If yes, comment on when/why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Q20: What needs to change or be in place in your area to enable Peace Walls to come down? Comment:

Or prioritise 1 to 3 of the following:

- Better security for houses
- Housing built in areas with waste-ground
- Better street lighting/CCTV
- Shops/employment opportunities
- Community policing/tackle ASB
- Community facilities

Q21: If the Peace Walls remain, what impact will they have on the following? (Tick Positive/ Negative/None for each issue)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Services or opportunities:</th>
<th>P/N/None</th>
<th>Personal/family impact:</th>
<th>P/N/None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shops/ post-office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School/College/Nursery</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value of your home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cost of living/insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to work / getting a job</td>
<td></td>
<td>Health and well-being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to training</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inter-community relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus / transport routes</td>
<td></td>
<td>(External) Perception of area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q22: Is there anything else you would like to comment on?

Be assured that all information provided today is confidential and will not be attributed to you. A general Attitudinal Report for the area will be produced.

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. It is greatly appreciated.

The Peace Walls Programme.
Appendix 2:
Progress to Date in each PWP Area

Black Mountain Shared Space Project (BMSSP)
Upper Springfield/Black Mountain (West Belfast)

Since the beginning of the Programme, movement towards changes has included the removal of three barriers, the ‘softening’ of two, greater accessibility at two and the reimaging of a further two.

• development of a major regeneration and capital build project at the Finlay’s site with funding of £6.4 million from the Peace IV ‘Shared Spaces and Services’ in partnership with Belfast City Council (BCC) to facilitate the development of a community hub and a range of services and amenities for use by local residents on a fully-integrated, shared space basis.

• planning permission at the Moyard site for the new build of 14 houses and the installation of a new play park with an existing peace fence ‘designed out’ as the project develops. Legal agreements are being finalised and the Housing Association involved has appointed a contractor. Construction work is likely to commence in the autumn of 2019.

• ongoing discussions with political and community representatives regarding potential developments at the Initial Laundry site. A proposal for a filling station, convenience store and food court to be developed at this site was recently withdrawn by the site developer.

• intra and inter-community engagement with schools, young people, women’s groups, and increasingly with groups of men including five women’s groups (one cross-community/four single identity), one men’s group, resident’s associations and its Youth Stream programme.

• partnership-working with three local schools on the Young People: Cross Community Schools Programme with plans to extend this programme into another two schools in the near future.

• the Upper Springfield/Black Mountain area is set to experience further regeneration including upgraded facilities for children and young people and a capital build programme to develop a cycle-path from the city centre which will link up with the shared space site and boost tourism.

Bogside/Brandywell Initiative (BBI)
Fountain Estate/Bishop Street (Londonderry/Derry)

Since the beginning of the Programme, changes have included the removal of window grilles on Long Tower Court and some on Upper Bennett Street, the reimaging of the interface wall, removal of gates on the city walls, the softening of the Dogleg structure and greater accessibility at the Dogleg site through the ‘events gate’.

• discussions with residents and statutory bodies relating to alterations and enhanced access at the Dogleg site through the ‘events gate’ remain on-going.

• an agreement to have a 3 month trial of day-time opening of the ‘events gate’ began in 2018 but was then halted within three weeks following objections raised by some residents at a public meeting in the Fountain Estate.
• engagement of an architect to develop proposals for change to this site with three options subsequently put out for consultation in March 2019. Despite support for one of the design proposals, progress has again stalled again while DoJ consults with political representatives. The DoJ has committed to funding re-developments at this site when political agreement to proceed has been reached.

• the NI Housing Executive issued a ‘Call for Tender’ in February 2019 for a feasibility study relating to the Gaol Tower project and its future use as a Shared Space. Following a ‘no response’ to the Tender call, the NI Housing Executive has reviewed the Tender with the intention to re-issue in the near future.

• partnership-working with the Creggan Neighbourhood Partnership to facilitate conversations with residents from Creggan and the Fountain Estate regarding dissident paramilitary activity in the area.

• ongoing classes, activities for young people, older people and families and key seasonal events like the Winter and Spring Markets, the Christmas Arts and Crafts Fair have enabled positive cross-community engagement and the breaking down of barriers and perceptions. At these times, there is free movement between the Fountain Estate and the surrounding areas with positive feedback from residents about such events.

Duncairn Community Partnership (DCP): Lower North Belfast

Since the beginning of the Programme, movement towards changes has included the complete removal of two barriers, the softening of one barrier, the removal of metal security grilles from seven houses on the interface, greater accessibility at seven barriers and the reimaging of a further two barriers.

• agreement negotiated with residents at the North Queen Street site to remove the high mesh peace fence in front of their homes, adjacent to the Interface at Duncairn Gardens. The NI Housing Executive is leading on the delivery of the capital works and residents are currently working with them to finalise the aftercare security arrangements for the homes which will be completed in advance of the removal of the fence and the other environmental works. This should be completed by late 2019.

• agreement negotiated with residents on the design and implementation of a scheme to remove the existing solid metal peace fence at the Hillman Court site. An old entry wall will be reinstated, mesh fencing will be replaced at Duncairn Gardens and gardens will be extended to meet the reinstated wall. Land transfer proceedings are ongoing and a contractor has been appointed. It is anticipated that this work will be completed by the end of 2019.

• completion of two sets of community consultation to remove a redundant peace fence at Parkside Gardens in April 2019 which received almost total agreement from residents in the Parkside and Mountcollyer areas. The DCP PWP has lobbied the DoJ to complete this work but a decision remains outstanding.

• agreement reached with residents on the removal of a section of the peace fence in Alexandra Park and the development of an Outdoor Learning Zone in its place. This facility would be used on a shared-space basis by local people and primary schools. Late objections to this scheme have stalled the consultation process and the DCP PWP continues to advocate for its implementation. This project would be led by Belfast City Council (BCC) with input from the DoJ.
consultation with agencies to develop a derelict site at Adam Street which was once a bonfire site on the interface. The proposals will be commercial rather than residential in nature but must include an element of community benefit. An ‘expression of interest’ call from the Department for Communities (DfC) to develop this site is needed to progress this work.

continuing conversations to remove part of the peace fence at the Edlingham Street site to be replaced with a boundary fence/new decorative gates.

working towards re-imaging work and extension to opening hours of the gates at the Hallidays Road site.

continuing advocacy for environmental improvement works at the Ponsonby Avenue site.

Greater Whitewell Community Surgery: Greater Whitewell Area

Since the beginning of the Programme, these have included the removal of three barriers and greater accessibility at one barrier.

development of a Belfast City Council-owned park and MUGA pitch at the Serpentine Road/Navarra Place site. The GWCS PWP was instrumental in the development of this ‘Shared Space’ project through consultation and negotiation with residents about changes at the site. Residents agreed that a solid peace fence could be removed and replaced with a mesh boundary fence around the pitch. The work was completed in July 2019 and the official opening of the Park took place in September 2019.

on-going consultations with residents to gauge interest in replacing a barrier which runs through their back gardens at the Serpentine Gardens/Gunnell Hill site. The NI Housing Executive will carry out an economic appraisal at this site to consider the potential to either reduce or remove this barrier and replace it with a retaining wall or garden boundary fences. This will include extending the gardens, removing the high barrier and replacing it with natural fencing.

partnership working with the NI Housing Executive to develop social housing for older people (55+) in the area and phase out a barrier/interface as it developed. Local primary school children were involved in the design of the art mosaic for the foyer.

partnership working with the NI Housing Executive towards re-opening derelict housing in the area, dealing with blight and a clean-up of waste ground between the Serpentine Road and Merston Gardens.

Residents are open to change in terms of fence removal and replacement with the school boundary fence subject to implementation of the Aftercare Package at the Hazelwood Integrated School/Throne Park site. Further meetings with Hazelwood Primary School and the residents most impacted will happen in the new academic year.

meetings continue with DoJ to discuss the potential ‘normalisation’ of the current automated security gate at the Graymount Crescent/Whitewell Road site. This is currently operated by the PSNI but in a recent consultation, residents reflected that they are keen to see changes.

ongoing activities including good relations programmes, a mental health programme, counselling and advice/support, projects with young people aged 12 to 15 years, a second with young people aged 16+ and a project for young people under 11.
IMAGINE Project: Cliftonville & Lower Oldpark (North Belfast)

The project began with 17 sites and is now focusing on seven key sites. The IMAGINE PWP was centrally involved in negotiating the removal of different sections of the main Peace Wall and military cladding at the former Girdwood Army Barracks which has now been developed into the ‘Girdwood Hub’.

- the development of a 3D model illustrating what possible change could occur along 200 metres of the main Peace Wall, including the potential for a major regeneration project that would have a focus on a soft-play area for local children, at Site 1. This site is a significant 4mtr high metal barrier/Peace Wall fence that is part of the main peace fence that divides the Lower Cliftonville and Lower Oldpark areas and runs from Cliftonpark Avenue, up Manor Close and across Manor Street to Rosevale Street.
- the continued development of the Men’s Shed project which opened in March 2018 at the interface buffer zone at Manor Street/Rosevale Street, with no negative incidents reported to date, and the connecting of it with Belfast City Council (BCC) Enterprise Awareness programme.
- additional development proposals from the Men’s Shed for further developments will be shared with other local groups for feedback/agreement before implementation.
- a planned new Public Realm Improvement Scheme to include new paving, benches, tree-planting and clean-up under the Department for Communities at Mountainview Street/Rosapenna Street and Oldpark Road.
- reimaging project with the Peace Walls being repainted and sectarian/paramilitary graffiti removed.
- a youth initiative and Peace Walls Survey involving more than 100 local young people.
- an intergenerational oral history project focused on memories of the area before and since the Peace Walls and publication of the same.
- resident agreement for the removal of concrete bollards at Brucevale Park.
- resident agreement to reduce the fence at Rosapenna Street.

Twaddell Ardoyne Shankill Communities in Transition (TASCIT)
Upper North Belfast

Since the beginning of the Programme movement towards change has included the removal of the first NI Housing Executive Peace Wall in over 30 years formerly situated at the front of the Crumlin Road. Preparatory work for the opening of two gates in the area is at an advanced stage and there are ongoing community consultations and the development of concept designs for transformation at three other sites.

- completion of an environmental improvement scheme and a new security gate is in place at the Colombia Street/Rosebank Street site opening onto the Crumlin Road. Consultation will now take place with residents about potential daytime opening of this gate.
- agreed timeline for completion of the installation of a new automated gate at the Flax Street site entrance to Ardoyne. This site has been closed for over 30 years and there now exists local consensus for daytime opening of the new gate.
- ongoing negotiations with the DoJ for the normalisation of the site at the junction of Alliance Avenue/Ardoyne Road including the removal of window grills and improved security for residents’ homes.
• ongoing consultation with residents about the potential for an environmental improvement scheme of a derelict space to replace the barrier at the Velsheda Park/Ardoyne Road site and consultation continues on the potential of reimagining/replacing a NI Housing Executive-owned wall at the junction.

• progress at the Alliance Avenue/Glenbryn Park structure to explore barrier reduction and environmental improvement, beginning with the Berwick Gap site. Concept plans will be developed for this site. The TASCIT PWP currently awaits feedback from the DoJ that this scheme will be funded subject to local agreement before undertaking further community consultation.

• widened engagement to include women’s groups from each of the four areas and rising numbers of participants in their ‘challenging conversations’ initiative – a training and awareness-raising programme which is run several times each year.

• additional cross-community activities including cultural and history/identity programmes, arts classes, ‘best practice’ visits and cross-border trips to sites of historical significance.
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Endnotes


10 The NIMDM (2017) provides an overall measure of multiple deprivation and also measures deprivation across seven variables at a Super Output Area (SOA) level. The most deprived SOA is ranked 1, and the least deprived has a rank of 890.


12 Directly comparative questions include questions 9, 12,14,15,16,17,18 and 19 which can be viewed in the Community Attitudes to Peace Walls Survey (2019) questionnaire
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